



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,877	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.318-US-01	1939
55895	7590	01/09/2007	EXAMINER	
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			ORR, HENRY W	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/09/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/800,877	GARCIA ET AL.	
	Examiner Henry Orr	Art Unit 2197	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/20/2005
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application communication filed March 15, 2004;
2. Claims 1-21 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on January 20, 2005 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

Specification

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - a) According to Fig. 7, “**Block 702**” should be replaced with “**Block 704**” on p. 17 line 16.
 - b) “**Block 702**” should be added to specification on p. 17 within the 11.3 Views section to accurately reflect the description of the display view feature of Block 702 in Fig. 7.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 15-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed merely to abstract ideas that are not tied to a technological art, environment, or machine which would result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claims considered to be Non-functional Descriptive Material are not statutory even if in combination with a physical medium. see MPEP § 2106

Regarding claims 15-21, the phrase “article of manufacture” is intended to cover a signal as disclosed in the specification (p. 6 lines 8-11). Claiming a signal per se is considered non-statutory subject matter because a signal is a form of energy.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15, recite the phrase “the Sheet Set Manager”.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because “the Sheet Set Manager” has not been previously recited.

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15, further recite the phrase “**Subsets and Sheets on the computer**”. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because it is unclear whether “**Subsets and Sheets**” are referring back to the subsets and the sheets previously recited within the claims. Examiner suggest to applicant to replace the phrase with “**the Subsets and the Sheets on the computer**” to overcome rejection.

Dependent claims 2, 9, and 16, recite the term “**Sheets**” in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims because it is unclear whether “**Sheets**” is referring back to “**the Sheets**” as recited in the respective base claims. Examiner suggest to applicant to replace the phrase with “**the Sheets**” to overcome rejection.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-21 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Double Patenting

9. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

10. Claims 1-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-33 of copending Application # 10/800585.

Although conflicting claims 1, 8 and 15 of instant application and claims 1, 12 and 23 of co-pending application # 10/800585 are not identical, the respective claims are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims recite similar features. However, claim 1 of copending application # 10/800585 recites the limitation "**Sheet Set Manager manages one or more different views for the Sheets**", which is an obvious variation of limitation "**Sheet Set Manager displays a logical structure for the Sheet Set, Subsets, and Sheets on the computer**" recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Sheet Set Manager function of the co-pending application # 10/800585 because the views of the Sheet Set are managed according to a logical structure and must be displayed in order for the usefulness for managing the views of the Sheet Set to be realized.

Claims 8 and 15 are substantially encompassed in claim 1 above, therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above in respect to claims 12 and 23 of the copending Application #10/800585.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

11. Claims 1-21 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of copending Application # 10/800786.

Although conflicting claims 1, 8 and 15 of instant application and claims 1, 6 and 11 of co-pending application # 10/800786 are not identical, the respective claims are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant claims recite similar features. However, claim 1 of copending application # 10/800786 recites the limitation "**Sheet Set Manager publishes the Sheet Set**", which is an obvious variation of limitation "**Sheet Set Manager displays a logical structure for the Sheet Set, Subsets, and Sheets on the computer**" recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Sheet Set Manager function of the co-pending application # 10/800786 because publishing the Sheet Set involves displaying on a computer a Sheet Set that is managed according to a logical structure.

Claims 8 and 15 are substantially encompassed in claim 1 above, therefore the claims are rejected under the same rationale as claim 1 above in respect to claims 6 and 11 of the copending Application #10/800786.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-14 and 16-21 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 9, 12, 15, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney et al. (hereafter referred to as Bonney), U.S. Patent # 6,466,953 B1 of record, in view of Takahashi et al. (hereafter referred to as Takahashi), U.S. Patent # 6,339,439 B1.**

The applied Bonney reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not

claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(l)(1) and § 706.02(l)(2).

Regarding claim 1, Bonney teaches “**Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models**” (col. 1 lines 26-30). (claim 1; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages a one or more Sheet Sets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of zero or more Sheets and Subsets of the Sheets, each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view, and the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more different views for the Sheets.) Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney further teaches “**where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets, and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program**” (abstract). (claim 1; i.e., the Sheet Set Manager displays a logical structure for the Sheet Set, Subsets and Sheets on the computer.) Examiner considers the hierarchical relationship amongst the graphical icons that represents drawing sheets to be a display of a logical structure for sheet sets, subsets,

and sheets. Bonney's Figure 2 illustrates the hierarchical logical structure displayed on a computer (see Figure 2 ref# 121).

Bonney does not expressly teach performing a Sheet Set Manager function in a graphics program. However, Bonny does teach a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (Bonney; abstract).

In the same field of endeavor, the relationship between drawing sheets is managed (Bonney; col. 1 lines 50-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bonny's application 220 of Figure 2 to include a Sheet Set Manager function as recited in claim 1 to perform the limitations of claim 1 as explained in the rationale above because the intent of Bonny invention was to accurately manage and use the drawing (Bonney; col. 1 lines 48-50). Thus, for the purpose of managing the drawings, a Manager Function would have been created. (claim 1; i.e., performing a Sheet Set Manager function in the graphics program)

Regarding claim 2, Bonney teaches "**The top level drawing sheet may be a view of the entire assembly, i.e., the fully assembled bicycle. Below this top level drawing sheet is one or more drawing sheets showing the many components making up the bicycle. These components, in turn, may have several drawing sheets below them showing the parts making up these components, and so forth**" (col. 1 lines 37-46). (claim 2; i.e., the logical structure comprises a hierarchical representation of the Sheet Set with a node representing the Sheet Set at a topmost level of the representation, one or more nodes representing the Subsets and Sheets at

a lower level of the representation, and one or more nodes representing the Sheets within the Subsets at a lowest level of the representation.) Examiner considers the component of the top level drawing sheet to be a node at the topmost level with lower components representing the nodes of at a lower level as illustrated in Bonny's Figure 5. (see col. 6 lines 59-67-col. 7 lines 1-8, Figure 5)

Regarding claim 5, Bonney teaches “Designer proceeds to create drawing defining the design. Because these designs may be defined using geometric models etc...Drawings may include many details of the models such as alternative views, sections, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models” (col.1 lines 17-30). (claim 5; i.e., wherein the Views are defined regions within the Sheets.) Examiner considers the detailed views to be defined geometric regions of the drawing sheets.

Claims 8, 9 and 12 are directed towards an apparatus and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5, respectfully; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the apparatus of Bonney's Figure 2 because the apparatus is capable of operating a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program to perform the limitations as recited in apparatus claims 8, 9 and 12 as further explained under the rationale of method claims 1, 2 and 5 above.

Claims 15, 16, and 19 are directed towards manufacture claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 1, 2 and 5, respectfully; therefore the

manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 1, 2 and 5 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the application program of Bonney's Figure 2 because the application program is capable of embodying logic for operating like a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program to perform the limitations as recited in manufacture claims 15, 16, and 19 as further explained under the rationale of method claims 1, 2 and 5 above. (Bonney; col. 4 lines 1-5)

14. Claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 13, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney, in view of Takahashi as cited and applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Kintzley et al. (hereafter referred to as Kintzley), U.S. Publication # 2004/0088305 A1.

The applied Kintzley reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the

application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Regarding claim 3, Bonney does not expressly teach displaying a window for providing a user with a "page-by-page" summary of the Sheet Set. However, Kintzley teaches "**the list view accompanies the hierarchical tree view and is used to display specific details for files 112 selected in the hierarchical tree view**" (p. 3 par. 44-53). (claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager is displayed as a window that includes a "Sheet List" tab that provides a user with a "page-by-page" summary of the Sheet Set, the Subsets, and the Sheets contained therein.) Examiner considers the files as drawing sheets and the hierarchical tree view as a window that can provide a user with "page-by-page" summary of the file that contains the drawing sheet. (see Figures 2A-2B)

In the same field of endeavor, the relationships between drawing sheets are managed (Kintzley; p. 1 par. 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bonny's application 220 of Figure 2 to include a reference manager for displaying file attribute summaries as taught by Kintzley using the sheet set functions as taught by Takahashi to provide the benefit of an improved graphical user interface that can display specific detailed information about a file so that a user quickly distinguish the file by the file attribute summary. (Kintzley; p. 1 par. 10, 21; p. 3 par. 44, 68)

Regarding claim 4, Bonney does not expressly teach displaying a window for managing views of a Sheet Set. However, Kintzley teaches “**Reference Manager 108 includes a hierarchical tree view that describes hierarchical relationships among the host files etc...files 112 are selected from a group comprising drawings, images etc...Reference Manager 108 is useful to anyone who has to manage large numbers complex file relationships**”(p. 2 par. 35). (claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager is displayed as a window that includes a "View List" tab that provides a method for managing views of the Sheets in the Sheet Set.) Examiner considers the hierarchical tree view as a display window that can manage file relationships for files that contain a drawing such as a view of a Sheet in a Sheet Set.

In the same field of endeavor, the relationships between drawing sheets are managed (Kintzley; p. 1 par. 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bonny's application 220 of Figure 2 to include a reference manager for managing files that contain drawings as taught by Kintzley using the sheet set functions as taught by Takahashi to provide the benefit of managing complex file relationships (Kintzley; abstract).

Regarding claim 6, Bonney does not expressly teach displaying a window for accessing files underlying the Sheets in the Sheet Set. However, Kintzley teaches “**The Saved Path indicates the path and file name where the file 112 is saved. The Found Path indicates the found path and file name for the externally referenced file 112. The Host Drawing indicates the path and the file name of the host file 112**” (p. 3 par. 64-66). (claim 6; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager is displayed as a

window that includes a "Resource Drawings" tab that provides a method for accessing files underlying the Sheets in the Sheet Set.) Examiner considers the Reference Manager to be able to display file paths for accessing files underlying the Sheets in the Sheet Set. (see Figures 2A-2B)

In the same field of endeavor, the relationships between drawing sheets are managed (Kintzley; p. 1 par. 10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bonny's application 220 of Figure 2 to include a reference manager for displaying file paths as taught by Kintzley using the sheet set functions as taught by Takahashi to provide the benefit of allowing the user to detect an unresolved path and allowing the user to correct the path in a single operation by selecting the "Apply Changes" button. (Kintzley; p. 3 par. 71)

Claims 10, 11 and 13 are directed towards an apparatus and are substantially encompassed in method claims 3, 4 and 6, respectfully; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 3, 4 and 6 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the apparatus of Bonney's Figure 2 because the apparatus is capable of operating a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program to perform the limitations as recited in apparatus claims 10, 11 and 13 as further explained under the rationale of method claims 3, 4 and 6 above.

Claims 17, 18, and 20 are directed towards manufacture claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 3, 4 and 6, respectfully; therefore the manufacture claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 3, 4 and 6

above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the application program of Bonney's Figure 2 because the application program is capable of embodying logic for operating like a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program to perform the limitations as recited in manufacture claims 17, 18, and 20 as further explained under the rationale of method claims 3, 4 and 6 above. (Bonney; col. 4 lines 1-5)

15. Claims 7, 14, 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bonney, in view of Takahashi as cited and applied to claim 1 above, in further view of Matthews et al. (hereafter referred to as Matthews), U.S. Patent # 7,047,180 B1.

The applied Matthews reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer

in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). This rejection might also be overcome by showing that the reference is disqualified under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) as prior art in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Regarding claim 7, Bonney does not expressly teach allowing the Sheet Set to be viewed as a collection of thumbnail previews. However, Matthews teaches “**a project web site may allow easy access to drawing data via a quick preview (e.g., a thumbnail view)**” (col. 5 lines 23-27). (claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager allows viewing of the Sheet Set as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail previews or properties.) Examiner considers the web page of preview images in Matthews Figures 5 and 6 to be a collection of graphical thumbnail previews for drawings of a Sheet Set.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bonney’s application program using the sheet set functions as taught by Takahashi to display thumbnail previews as taught by Matthews to provide the benefit of preventing the user of manually publishing or converting the drawing or manually searching for the information using a drawing viewer (Matthews; col. 5 lines 25-27).

Claim 14 is directed towards an apparatus and is substantially encompassed in method claim 7, respectfully; therefore the apparatus claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 7 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the apparatus of Bonney’s Figure 2 because the apparatus is capable of operating a graphic program such as a

computer aided design application program to perform the limitations as recited in apparatus claim 14 as further explained under the rationale of method claim 7 above.

Claim 21 is directed towards a manufacture claim and is substantially encompassed in method claim 7, respectfully; therefore the manufacture claim is rejected under the same rationale as method claim 7 above. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the application program of Bonney's Figure 2 because the application program is capable of embodying logic for operating like a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program to perform the limitations as recited in manufacture claim 21 as further explained under the rationale of method claim 7 above. (Bonney; col. 4 lines 1-5)

Conclusion

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 274 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Jackson can be reached on (571) 270 1279. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Henry Orr
Examiner
Art Unit 2197

12/28/2006
HO

Henry Orr

Frantz Coby
FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER